
READERSHIP OF FREE COMMUNITY PAPERS AS A SOURCE OF ADVERTISING INFORMATION: A USES AND GRATIFICATIONS PERSPECTIVE

By James C. Tsao and Stanley D. Sibley



The free paper is a convenient and relevant advertising information source, performing the functions of providing surveillance information and product values to consumers. Several market segments with varying market attributes are identified as heavy readers of the free paper. Based on the theoretical framework of uses and gratifications, a multivariate model helps to explain readership. Readership of the free paper increases as age increases, as involvement in some leisure lifestyles increases, as more favorable attitude toward the free paper increases, and as the value of information on homes and equipment and on food and supplies increases.

Free community papers, also called “shopper’s guides,” “penny savers,” or “free papers,” are advertising publications either distributed without charge to almost every household within a community area or free to be picked up at a paper rack.¹ Publishers of free papers rely strictly on advertising income for profitability. Compared to paid daily and weekly newspapers, free papers often are smaller and provide proportionally more advertising information.²

While paid daily newspapers enjoy the reputation as one of the most favorable media,³ free papers have long been criticized as “junk papers.”⁴ Some critics believe that free papers are an “endangered species” due to the rapid development of new communication technologies, fierce competition from weekly paid newspapers, and aggressive buyouts of free papers by daily newspapers.⁵

Contrary to this prediction, the free paper industry has not only survived this intense competition, but also has continued to grow steadily. The exact number of free papers is difficult to ascertain; yet an estimate suggests about 3,200 publications in business.⁶ The circulation of free papers in 1968 was estimated at 30 million. It reached 88 million

by 2000, four times higher than that of paid weeklies and outnumbering that of all daily newspapers.⁷

While the free paper industry takes pride in being the “only possible direct print competition”⁸ to paid weekly and daily newspapers in local markets, some major concerns have been raised by the industry. At the core is the lack of advertisers’ recognition.⁹ National advertisers rarely choose the medium to reach consumers, even though free papers provide a source of free advertising information to consumers.¹⁰ While local advertisers consider paid daily newspapers as the most effective advertising medium, their usage rate of free papers is often the lowest among all advertising media.¹¹

These issues raise several fundamental questions. Who reads free papers? Why do they read them? What is the readership profile of free papers that has contributed to their growth? The purpose of the current study is to reduce the research gap by analyzing the readership profile of free papers.

This study is significant to both practitioners and scholars. Practitioners ask for accountability when making decisions on media planning. The lack of research on free papers inhibits practitioners from understanding the value of this advertising medium.¹² An empirical and objective analysis of the readership of free papers could help media planners understand the role and positioning of the free paper in the media mix to achieve their advertising objectives effectively.

To scholars, the study provides a starting point to build a model on the readership of free papers. Academic researchers have studied local media from different perspectives, including community involvement,¹³ media economics,¹⁴ and newspaper readership.¹⁵ However, most of the studies focused on the topics of paid dailies and weeklies. The current study adds a new angle to the media research stream by analyzing free papers as a local advertising medium. Specifically, the model of uses and gratifications is applied as a theoretical foundation to understand why free papers are read and to what extent these publications fulfill the needs of their readers.

The Free Paper Industry. Although free papers appeared sporadically in the United States in the early 1900s, it took a long time for them to become a competitive and mass medium.¹⁶ By the 1950s, many free papers began to appear and develop close ties with local communities in areas where paid weekly and daily newspapers already had built strong footholds.¹⁷ In the 1970s, the fierce competition for advertising dollars in many markets resulted in the establishment of new free papers by paid weeklies and buyouts of free papers by daily newspapers.¹⁸ Several movements emerged during this competitive era.¹⁹ First, the quality of free papers improved as the circulation of paid newspapers declined. Second, the expansion of the personal nonpostal delivery system by free papers reduced the importance of the Second-Class mailing cost advantage claimed by paid newspapers. Third, free papers increased their circulation, making them a more competitive advertising medium.

Literature Review

In addition, economic and sociological factors contributed to the development of the free paper industry. First, the low cost of advertising rates for free papers compared to those of daily newspapers has been a competitive advantage. The impetus for publishing free papers in their early history was to fulfill advertisers' need for a low-cost advertising medium. That still is evident today.²⁰ Second, since the 1960s the population growth in suburban communities, coupled with the increased buying power of these consumers, has made this group a major market segment by itself. Suburban consumers also represented the most important readership of newspapers and free papers.²¹ Lastly, as more females became employed outside the home and as more live alone or just with children, their role has changed dramatically. Females have taken a greater role in decision making, have sought more information on making product and service choices, have used advertising information effectively, and have become more efficient shoppers.²²

Research in Uses and Gratifications

Do people seek advertising messages in free papers to fill in their information needs? If so, what circumstances would make people choose them as a source of advertising information? One approach to answering such questions is the model and research on uses and gratifications. The uses and gratifications perspective has been considered an "axiomatic theory in that it is readily applicable to wide ranging situations involving mediated communication."²³ The model assumes that audiences are active communicators with self-aware needs, motivating them to choose media content instead of experiencing incidental or passive media exposure.²⁴ It also assumes that media usage competes with other bases of need gratifications.²⁵ More specifically, the theory is used in this study to examine what readers do with free papers rather than what free papers do to readers.²⁶

Although the concept of uses and gratifications provided many promises to communication research, it has been criticized for being vague in theoretical development and short of in-depth findings due to methodological shortcomings.²⁷ It has been argued that the theoretical framework lacked a broader model, one that might include lifestyles and activities to explain the complex role of media uses and gratifications.²⁸

The early research of uses and gratifications focused mostly on media effects of quiz programs and soap operas,²⁹ radio music,³⁰ and newspaper reading.³¹ As the theory gained acceptance, the paradigm shifted to the functional approach studying the communication process from the audience's perspective rather than from the communicators' viewpoint.³² Previous studies provided a general framework on first-order gratifications sought from the mass media, such as surveillance, entertainment, and parasocial interaction.³³ However, Swanson discussed the need to study second-order gratifications, which are individual differences resulting in particular gratifications from message content.³⁴ Swanson's position is applicable to examining free papers for being considered not only a print medium, but also a medium offering

largely advertising information. The second-order gratifications involving message content appear relevant to the focus of the present study.

Advertising Applications in Uses and Gratifications. The concept of uses and gratifications has been applied to advertising research. At the societal level, Rotzoll, Haefner, and Sandage suggested that prospective buyers presumably can "accept, reject, or ignore, thus directing the flow of societal resources through the full meaning of consumer sovereignty."³⁵ In other words, consumers do not passively take advertising for granted. Instead, they choose advertisements that they desire to perceive, especially if the advertisements could fulfill "aesthetic, emotional or intellectual"³⁶ expectations. In such cases, an advertisement is valuable only if the message is meaningful. Therefore, it might be more helpful to "think less about what advertising does to people, and more about what people do with advertising."³⁷

Several studies supported the conclusion that consumers were active and expectation-driven when encountering advertisements. Plummer presented an advertising communication model emphasizing audience contributions to advertising outcomes.³⁸ Factor analysis revealed seven dimensions of viewing responses to television commercials: entertainment or stimulation, irritation, familiarity, empathy or gratifying involvement, confusion, informativeness or personal relevance, and brand reinforcement.³⁹ Schlinger tested how people feel after watching television commercials.⁴⁰ The results were similar to Plummer's findings. Entertainment was the leading factor, followed by confusion, relevant news, brand reinforcement, empathy, familiarity, and alienation. Crosier⁴¹ offered seven types of satisfaction with advertising exposure: product information, entertainment, implied warranty, value addition, post-purchase reassurance, vicarious experience, and involvement.

Alwitt and Prabhaker and O'Donohoe⁴² provided more consumer insights toward advertising. Their studies showed that attitudes toward television commercials were related to the functions served by advertisements, including hedonic, knowledge, social learning or contact, and value affirmation. Using qualitative methods to study advertising classification, O'Donohoe revealed six categories of advertising consumption: marketing uses, structuring time, enjoyment, scanning the environment, social interaction, and self-affirmation/transformation. These categories have much in common with those rooted in media research of uses and gratifications. As such, O'Donohoe suggested, "advertising seems at least as fruitful an area for the application of uses and gratifications theory as any other element of the mass media."⁴³

Advertising of Weekly and Daily Newspapers in Uses and Gratifications. The advertising functions provided by weekly and daily papers are relevant to free papers because of their similarities, including overlapped readership and perceived favorability by their readers. Newspaper advertising was considered more favorably than any other type of content; however, half of newspaper readers spent more time reading news than reading advertisements.⁴⁴ Research also showed that newspaper advertising not only was considered more useful than any

other newspaper content,⁴⁵ but also enjoyed the highest readership of any kind of information content.⁴⁶ Abrams, Kaul, and Ma found a strong relationship between the perceived values of advertising and of news messages.⁴⁷ As the perceived value of advertising increased, so did the attitude toward the news, especially with middle- and lower-class readers.

Newspaper advertising primarily provides readers two functions: surveillance and interaction. Surveillance can be identified when readers of daily newspapers consider advertising as a source of local news.⁴⁸ Readers may decide what to purchase, how to arrange their free and shopping schedule, and how to use other opportunities after reading newspaper advertisements.⁴⁹ This finding was reinforced by classified advertising being rated the highest in readership of any type of newspaper information.⁵⁰ In addition, newspaper advertising, as well as free-paper advertising, informed readers of social standards and norms of the local environment.⁵¹ For example, fashionable apparel advertisements from a local department store often can create an idea of what is suitable and conventional to wear in a community.⁵²

Interaction is a subtle function. Research shows that the behavior of reading newspaper advertisements can be explained by the concept of interpersonal interaction.⁵³ Readers use information learned from advertising to interact with the social environment. Young adults often used advertising as subjects in social exchanges that may not be relevant to the advertised product.⁵⁴

The overall conclusion from these studies is a pattern of readership segmentation for advertising usage ranging from low to high readers. Readers have been active and selective about advertising content.⁵⁵ However, more variables are needed to help explain uses and gratifications of advertising readership of free papers as a source of advertising information.

Conceptual Framework

One criticism of previous studies on uses and gratifications was the lack of a broader scope, including demographics, when explaining media or advertising usage.⁵⁶ However, demographics have been used to explain the uses and gratifications of newspaper advertising. Gender was found to be a strong variable explaining the readership of three product types of advertising: automobile, grocery, and department store. Automobile advertisements attracted primarily males' interest, while grocery and department store advertising significantly appealed to females.⁵⁷ Moreover, those with lower social economic status and living in suburban and rural areas were more interested in newspaper food advertisements than households with children, of singles, and of the elderly.⁵⁸

Gender and age also predicted attitudes toward news and advertising. Female readers perceived advertising to be more valuable than news, while older readers rated news to be more useful than advertising.⁵⁹ One study on healthcare and direct-to-consumer advertising for prescription drugs found that females used a variety of print, broadcast,

and Internet media sources for advertising information to make decisions.⁶⁰ Females with an age of 45 years or older rated prescription drug advertisements higher in believability and understandability than other advertising. The females also had higher usage of newspaper and magazine advertising than other media advertising.⁶¹

Moreover, there was a positive relationship between demographics of a local community and attitudes toward advertising perceived by practitioners.⁶² According to these research conclusions, it is reasonable to believe that there would be relationships between the free-paper readership and demographic characteristics. Therefore, the first alternative hypothesis was:

H1: The relationship between the readership of free papers and demographics would show differences.

Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch suggested that “the media compete with other sources of need satisfactions... [A] proper view of the role of the media in need satisfaction should take into account other functional alternatives—including different, more conventional, and ‘older’ ways of fulfilling needs.”⁶³ In light of this view, leisure activity fulfilling various need satisfactions is an appropriate variable to be included in the equation. Suggested also by the bio-ecological theory of the niche, individuals have limited amount of time to spend on different activities.⁶⁴ Free papers compete for the consumers’ pool of audience attention in the community of media ecology. As such, it was logical to predict that consumers engaging in leisure activities seek information on products and services associated with their activities.

Leisure activities as a part of audience lifestyles have been addressed in studies of consumer behavior⁶⁵ and readership involvement.⁶⁶ Leisure behaviors not only changed across the life spans of consumers,⁶⁷ but were also often displaced by media use.⁶⁸ Different leisure activities were shown to be associated with attitudes toward advertising.⁶⁹ Free papers are a print medium providing advertising information to readers who might have different interest areas reflected by their leisure activities. The variety of information published in free papers suggests that the readership of this medium as a source of advertising information may be explained by segments of consumers engaged in specific leisure activities. Therefore, the second hypothesis was:

H2: The relationship between the readership of free papers and leisure activities of readers would show differences.

Advertising has been described as “salesmanship in print.”⁷⁰ The mission of salesmanship is especially applicable to free papers that publish classified and local advertisements primarily promoting product attributes instead of brand images. Schudson concluded that the connection between classified advertising and consumer contact directly influenced buying decisions.⁷¹ Rotzoll, Haefner, and Sandage supported the

concept that consumers were active information seekers who were able to sort out many competing messages before making purchasing decisions.⁷² Plummer provided a theoretical view of communication by describing the relationship of audience choices to product purchase stimulated by advertising.⁷³ As suggested by the model on uses and gratifications, the authors shared the same view of the direct impact of advertising on buying decisions of information seekers.

Several studies supported the view of advertising exposure contributing to purchasing experience. O'Donohoe showed advertising fulfilling the need of product information, consumption stimulation, and value addition.⁷⁴ The direct relationship was even more evident when subjects were analyzed in experimental settings, showing that advertising exposure set an agenda for product trial processing.⁷⁵ Furthermore, in the readership survey of a small daily newspaper, Griswold and Moore revealed that different types of advertising usage resulted from various needs.⁷⁶ Use of grocery ads appeared to be "role-specific," while use of classified ads seemed to be "situation-specific."⁷⁷ These studies suggested that there was a direct relationship between advertising and product purchases. As such, the third hypothesis was:

H3: The relationship between the readership of free papers and product information would show differences.

McQuail believed that one of the reformed premises in uses and gratification is that a particular type of media information has meaning that can be perceived positively or negatively.⁷⁸ This simple suggestion provided a clearer research mission: traits of media or information can be identified and subjects can answer how they rate each attribute as they apply it to specific media and content. McQuail developed fourteen categories of motives for using the media and satisfactions from having used the media; examples included getting information and advice, reducing personal insecurity, filling time, finding support for one's own values, having a substitute for social contact, and acquiring a structure for daily routine.⁷⁹ Consistent with McQuail's suggestions, O'Donohoe developed twenty attributes in the six categories to explain advertising uses and gratifications.⁸⁰ Moreover, previous studies on newspaper and advertising found various types of needs for reading news and advertisements.⁸¹ Therefore, the first research question asked:

RQ1: What are the attitudes toward free papers?

Research on advertising readership can be enriched when analyzed from a multivariate perspective. This approach is especially meaningful for free papers because they are an advertising medium that should be interrelated with various consumer perceptions and behaviors. Therefore, the second research question asked:

RQ2: What model, including attitudes, demographics, leisure behaviors, and product information, can help to explain the readership of free papers?

Method

Readership of free papers (the dependent variable) was analyzed in terms of four sets of independent variables: demographic characteristics, leisure behaviors, product information, and attitudes.

Demographics. Demographic variables include age, gender, household income, personal income, marital status, number of children, and occupation.

Leisure Behaviors. Respondents were asked to evaluate the extent to which they were involved in leisure activities in the past year. The activities were developed according to the categories in the studies of Danko and Schaninger⁸² and Scott and Willitis.⁸³ The responses were measured by the perceived degree of involvement in each of 37 leisure activities on a 6-point scale ranging from "None," "Very Low," "Low," "Some," "High," to "Very High." The Cronbach's alpha of the overall response was .89.

Product Information. Respondents were asked to rate free papers for advertising information to help them purchase the 20 types of products/services commonly advertised in free papers. The responses were measured by the perceived value of each of the product and service categories on a 5-point scale ranging from "Very Low," "Low," "Some," "High," to "Very High" (Alpha of the overall response was .93).

Attitudes. Respondents were asked to indicate their motives and gratifications with free papers by specifying their degree of agreement or disagreement on 12 statements. The statements were measured on a 7-point scale including "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," "Slightly Disagree," "No Opinion," "Slightly Agree," "Agree," and "Strongly Agree." The statements were modified according to the studies of McQuail⁸⁴ and O'Donohoe.⁸⁵ Seven of the statements were worded positively, while five were worded negatively. The alpha values for the positive and negative responses were .86 and .76, respectively.

Readership. The readership of free papers was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from "Hardly ever," "Some of the time," "Most of the time," to "Always or almost always." A separate category of "Never" was provided, but it was excluded from the data analysis. The mean was 3.64, while the standard deviation was 1.08.

The cover letter and questionnaire were pre-tested with small focus groups and individuals with varied backgrounds. The survey materials included a pre-questionnaire notification postcard; the mailing package consisting of a cover letter, questionnaire, postage-paid business reply envelope, and one-dollar incentive; and a follow-up reminder postcard. These materials were pretested in one county in the sampled state, with 100 randomly drawn names from the telephone book. The pretest resulted in a 41% return rate of usable questionnaires by the cutoff date.

The sample was a random selection of 5,031 households from a Midwestern state. A list broker supplied the mailing list. A total of 2,032

TABLE 1
Mean Differences of Demographics on Readership of Free Papers

Variables	Attributes	Mean*	n	s.d.	d.f.	F/T value	Sig.
Age					1613	8.07	<.001
	65+	3.87	343	1.00			
	55-64	3.68	247	1.07			
	45-54	3.72	300	1.08			
	35-44	3.52	368	1.10			
	18-34	3.48	360	1.06			
Education					1625	10.11	<.001
	College graduate or more	3.43	449	1.08			
	Some college	3.67	631	1.07			
	High school graduate	3.79	451	1.04			
	Some high school & under high school	3.83	98	1.06			
Income (Personal)					1457	7.12	<.001
	\$100,000+	3.05	57	1.08			
	75,000-99,999	3.30	56	1.14			
	50,000-74,999	3.48	199	1.08			
	25,000-49,999	3.66	590	1.06			
	Below 25,000	3.77	253	1.09			
Income (Household)					1004	10.57	<.001
	\$100,000+	3.27	124	1.09			
	75,000-99,999	3.51	175	1.09			
	50,000-74,999	3.66	311	1.04			
	25,000-49,999	3.89	314	1.03			
	Below 25,000	3.99	85	1.06			
Marital Status					1601	3.65	<.05
	Married	3.70	1087	1.07			
	Living w/ friends	3.57	122	1.05			
	Single/living alone/with parents	3.54	395	1.07			
Occupation					1235	3.03	<.005
	Clerical/Retail sales/Services	3.70	223	1.06			
	Farmer/Rancher	3.76	45	1.19			
	Tradesman/Laborer	3.72	261	1.04			
	Lower management/Nonretail	3.43	42	1.19			
	Middle management	3.60	110	1.09			
	Upper management/Business Owner	3.33	96	1.10			
	Others	3.62	125	1.08			
Gender					1635	-2.58	<.05 (2-tailed)
	Male	3.58	833	1.06			
	Female	3.71	804	1.08			

* The readership of free papers was measured on a 5-point scale ranging from "Hardly ever," "Some of the time," "Most of the time," to "Always or almost always." A separate category of "Never" was provided for responses, but it was excluded from the data analysis.

TABLE 2
*Factors of Leisure Activities**

Activities/Factors	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9
F1: Socializers									
Dancing	0.60	0.14	0.12	0.09	0.07	0.24	-0.05	0.10	-0.11
Going out for the night	0.74	0.08	0.19	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	0.16	0.17	0.18
Going to bars	0.69	0.26	-0.03	0.00	-0.16	-0.06	0.08	0.13	-0.11
Going to parties or social functions	0.70	0.08	0.22	0.17	0.24	0.00	0.12	0.03	0.10
F2: Outdoor People									
Boating/sailing	0.23	0.66	0.22	-0.02	0.09	-0.02	-0.05	0.01	0.07
Camping/hiking	0.22	0.60	0.26	0.10	-0.04	0.03	-0.14	0.17	-0.04
Fishing	0.09	0.80	0.02	-0.04	0.02	0.05	0.12	-0.06	0.10
Hunting/shooting	0.06	0.76	-0.11	-0.06	-0.02	0.05	0.12	-0.02	0.05
Repairing cars	-0.06	0.55	-0.05	0.07	-0.04	0.05	0.12	0.13	-0.04
F3: Cultural Experiencers									
Traveling	0.20	0.15	0.65	0.22	0.06	0.07	0.17	-0.05	0.15
Visiting art galleries/museums	0.03	0.00	0.74	0.07	0.23	0.26	0.03	0.07	-0.08
F4: Music Lovers									
Listening to music at home	0.21	0.08	0.07	0.67	0.09	0.06	-0.02	0.11	-0.10
F5: Actives									
Participating in religious- related activities	-0.03	-0.05	0.05	0.19	0.77	0.06	-0.04	-0.04	0.11
Physical fitness (jogging, walking, etc.)	0.14	0.13	0.30	0.18	0.41	-0.08	0.15	0.25	0.21
F6: Crafters									
Collecting/collection of items	0.09	0.17	0.21	0.11	-0.06	0.56	0.08	0.10	0.05
Doing needlework/knitting /sewing	0.01	-0.05	-0.06	0.14	0.13	0.71	0.00	-0.03	-0.13
Doing hobbies (arts, crafts, etc.)	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.10	0.13	0.76	-0.01	0.10	0.16
F7: Passives									
Watching spectator sports	0.11	0.16	0.19	0.00	0.21	-0.04	0.70	0.14	0.14
Watching television/videos	0.08	-0.01	-0.06	0.39	-0.19	0.12	0.62	0.13	0.05
F8: Internet Surfers									
Playing video/computer games	0.15	0.14	-0.05	0.20	0.00	0.15	0.23	0.67	-0.20
Surfing the Internet	0.14	0.04	0.12	0.08	-0.01	0.04	-0.03	0.79	0.11
F9: Master Gardeners									
Gardening or working in yard	0.00	0.25	-0.03	0.12	0.22	0.23	-0.03	-0.01	0.66
Eigenvalues	8.12	3.00	2.05	1.83	1.54	1.32	1.23	1.09	1.00
Variance explained (%)	21.94	8.11	5.53	4.96	4.15	3.56	3.33	2.96	2.71

* The cut-off Scores on factor loadings for retained variables are >.4 on one factor and <.3 on other factors.

TABLE 3
*Leisure Activities as Predictors of Free Papers Readership**

Predictor	B	β	t	Sig.
Actives	-0.01	-0.01	-0.47	ns
Crafters	0.05	0.16	5.99	<.001
Cultural Experiencers	-0.01	-0.02	-0.67	ns
Internet Surfers	-0.04	-0.10	-3.71	<.001
Master Gardeners	0.07	0.10	3.72	<.001
Music Lovers	0.02	0.03	0.98	ns
Outdoor People	0.02	0.09	3.37	0.001
Passives	0.02	0.05	1.80	0.073
Socializers	-0.02	-0.09	-3.10	0.002

* R=.251, R-Square=.063, d.f.=1,515, F=83.09, $p < .001$

questionnaires were returned, yielding a 40.4% response rate. Of these, 72 were dropped from further analysis because of incompleteness or late return.

Results

H1: The relationship between the readership of free papers and demographics would show differences.

A series of ANOVA tests and a *t*-test in Table 1 show that seven out of eight demographic variables yield significant relationships at the .05 level or better with free paper readership. These variables are age, education, gender, household income, personal income, marital status, and occupation. The number of children is the only variable not statistically associated with free paper readership.

The demographics show the following profile: Readers in the older age groups and described as females with lower household and personal income, married, and lower educational levels are associated with higher free paper readership. In contrast, readers in the younger age groups and described as males with higher household and personal income, singles/living alone/living with parents, and higher educational levels are associated with lower free paper readership. Lower and upper managers and professionals have lower free paper readership than farmers, clerical/retail sales/service people, tradesmen/laborers/machine operators, and middle managers. Given only one variable that is statistically insignificant, most of the H1 was supported.

H2: The relationship between the readership of free papers and leisure activities of readers would show differences.

Respondents were asked, "How involved were you in each of the following leisure activities during the past year?" Responses to thirty-

TABLE 4
Valued Information on These Products/Services

Products/Services	F1	F2	F3
F1: Home, equipment & used items			
Auctions/auctioneers	0.70	0.02	0.00
Employment	0.62	0.16	0.28
Farm equipment	0.72	-0.04	0.08
Houses for sale	0.74	0.17	0.16
Landscaping services	0.69	0.24	0.16
Pets/animals	0.69	0.13	0.19
Rentals of houses/apartments	0.72	0.12	0.18
Used cars/trucks/vans	0.76	0.15	0.18
F2: Food & supplies			
Groceries	-0.02	0.74	0.23
Restaurants	0.19	0.86	0.05
Restaurant specials	0.16	0.86	0.05
F3: Computers/printers/software			
Computers/printers/software	0.24	0.13	0.83
Eigenvalues	8.52	2.23	1.17
Variance explained (%)	42.58	11.14	5.86

seven leisure activities were subjected to a principal component factor analysis using the Varimax method. The cut-off scores on factor loadings for retained variables are $>.4$ on one factor and $<.3$ on other factors.⁸⁶ The results in Table 2 yield nine factors: Socializers (dancing, going out for the night, going to bars, and/or going to parties or social functions), Outdoor People (boating, camping, fishing, hunting, and/or repairing cars), Cultural Experiencers (visiting art galleries/museums and/or friends/relatives), Music Lovers (listening to music at home), Actives (participating in religious and/or physical fitness), Crafters (collecting items, doing needlework and/or doing hobbies), Passives (watching spectator sports and/or watching televisions or videos), Internet Surfers (playing computer or video/computer games and/or surfing the Internet), and Master Gardeners (gardening or working in the yard). The groups of Internet Surfers and Music Lovers are individual variables.

A multiple linear regression analysis in Table 3 reveals that the model significantly contributed to identifying five leisure groups as predictors for free paper readership ($p<.001$, R-Square=.063). The heavier free paper readership is significantly predicted by increasing involvement in crafting, gardening, and outdoor activities. In contrast, the light free paper readership can be explained by increasing involvement in socializing and surfing on the Internet/playing video games. The group with the passive activities is only marginally positively associated with readership ($p=.073$). According to the significant results, H2 was partially supported.

H3: The relationship between the readership of free papers and product information would show differences.

TABLE 5

*Products/Services Purchased/Used as Predictors of Free Papers Readership**

Predictor	B	β	t	Sig.
Home/Equipment	0.02	0.16	5.92	<.001
Food/Supplies	0.13	0.38	15.20	<.001
Computers & Accessories	-0.01	-0.02	-0.87	ns

* R=.44, R-Square=.20, d.f.=1,494, F=122.11, $p<.001$

Respondents were asked, “How valuable are free papers for advertising information to help you buy or use the following types of products/services?” Answers to twenty products and services were reduced to three groups from a principal component factor analysis with a Varimax rotation. The cut-off scores for retained items were the same as for leisure activities.⁸⁷ Table 4 shows the product groups: Home/Equipment (auctions/auctioneers, employment, farm equipment, houses for sale, landscaping services, pets/animals, rentals of houses/apartments, and/or used cars/trucks/vans), Food/Supplies (groceries, restaurants, and/or restaurant specials), and Computers and Accessories. A multiple regression model ($p<.001$, R-Square=.20) in Table 5 reveals that heavy readership is associated with the perceived higher value of advertising information that helps consumers buy or use the products of home/equipment and food/supplies. Since two of the three variables yielded significant results, **H3** was mostly supported.

RQ1: What are the attitudes toward free papers?

Table 6 shows twelve items subjected to a factor analysis with a Varimax rotation of the different attitudes toward the attributes of free papers. The cut-off scores for retained items were the same as for leisure activities. The results produced two factors: “Convenient and Relevant Information Source,” representing positive attitudes toward free papers, and “Information Surveillance and Values,” representing another perspective of attitudes toward free papers. The first factor reveals that readers consider free papers a convenient source of advertising information. Reading free papers is part of their routine. Readers also prefer using free papers to find advertising information even though a paid newspaper may provide similar information. The second factor shows readers’ perceptions of the extent to which free papers help consumers find valuable information on products and services that they are interested in buying.

RQ2: What model, including attitudes, demographics, leisure behaviors, and product information can help to explain the readership of free papers?

TABLE 6
Factors of Attitudes towards Free Papers

Attitudes	F1	F2
F1: Convenient and Relevant Information Source		
It is a convenient source of ad information.	0.75	0.28
It helps me recognize a good quality product/service does not necessarily have a high price.	0.69	0.08
I can easily find product information that I need in free papers.	0.70	0.10
I prefer to use free papers although the paid newspaper may provide similar ad information.	0.73	0.03
Many ads in the free paper have value to me.	0.73	0.15
Reading free papers is part of my routine.	0.78	0.22
Free papers delivered to my box is a nice convenience.	0.69	0.31
F2: Information Surveillance and Values (Scores are reverse coded in the analysis.)		
It appears only inexpensive products or services are advertised in free papers.	-0.07	0.62
Ads in free papers usually do not have anything to do with me.	0.25	0.70
The manner that free papers are delivered to my home really bothers me.	0.11	0.60
It does not help me find a good price for the products or services that I am interested in buying.	0.28	0.73
When looking for product information in a free paper, I find it difficult because of so many ads on a page.	0.11	0.62
Eigenvalues	5.10	1.72
Variance explained (%)	39.21	13.20

Only significant and noncategorical variables tested for the hypotheses and for answering the first research question were analyzed in a multiple linear regression model. Household income also was dropped in the model because it had high multicollinearity with personal income. Table 7 shows that eight out of thirteen variables could help predict free paper readership ($p < .001$, R-Square=.472].

Age is the only significant demographic predictor. The older the reader, the heavier the readership. Master Gardeners and Outdoor People are positively associated with heavier readership, and Socializers are negatively associated with readership.

Both Home/Equipment and Food/Supplies product information type measures are significant predictors of free paper readership. Consumers who are heavier free paper readers believe the medium provides valuable advertising information and helps them purchase or use Home/Equipment and Foods/Supplies. Heavier free paper readership also is associated with consumers believing that the free paper provides convenient and relevant information and helps them find valuable information that fulfills the surveillance function.

At least three perspectives could be drawn from the study: theoretical, image, and media-planning implications for free papers. In theory, the findings of the study support previous research on uses and gratifications, which can be extended to advertising research. The study shows

**Discussion,
Conclusion**

TABLE 7
*Multivariate Analysis of Free Papers Readership**

Predictor	B	β	t	Sig.
Demographics				
Age	0.07	0.09	3.54	<.001
Education	0.05	0.04	1.88	ns
Personal income	-0.01	-0.02	-0.66	ns
Attitudes				
Convenient and Relevant Information Source	0.09	0.51	18.98	<.001
Information Surveillance and Values	0.02	0.12	4.96	<.001
Leisure Activities				
Crafters	0.01	0.03	1.21	ns
Internet Surfers	0.00	0.00	-0.10	ns
Master Gardeners	0.03	0.05	2.09	<.050
Outdoor People	0.01	0.07	3.09	<.005
Passives	0.00	-0.01	-0.33	ns
Socializers	-0.01	-0.05	-2.05	<.050
Product Information				
Home/Equipment	0.01	0.07	2.76	<.010
Food/Supplies	0.04	0.11	4.29	<.001

* R=.687, R-Square=.472, d.f.=1,242, F=85.38, $p<.001$

that free paper readers are active information seekers who could identify their needs and would use this medium to obtain advertising information. The study also supports McQuail's⁸⁸ suggestions on the uses and gratifications categories of convenience, information surveillance, and personal identity, as well as O'Donohoe's⁸⁹ items on advertising consumption including scanning the environment and self-confirmation. For examples, readers consider free papers to be a convenient source of advertising information. They use the medium to search for information that fulfills or confirms their need for quality products with good exchanged values. Many consumers are routine readers who develop a loyal tie to the medium even though daily newspapers provide similar advertising information.

One finding in the study shows that free papers are perceived as an informative and relevant source, which confirms McQuail's category of personal relationship with media.⁹⁰ The study also shows that advertising information in free papers helps readers purchase or use a variety of products/services. The findings suggest that there are individual differences resulting in particular gratifications toward different products/services advertised in free papers. The results follow the concept of the second-order gratifications revealed in message content proposed by Swanson.⁹¹

The image perspective of free papers is an interesting finding. As mentioned, free papers have been perceived stereotypically as “junk papers.”⁹² However, these results show an opposite and rather positive image. Significant uses and gratifications indicate that readers understand the value of free papers. They treat the medium as a convenient and relevant source that provides valuable advertising messages. This positive image is supported by the significant relationship of free paper readership with demographic characteristics and leisure activities. The majority of demographics, including age, education, gender, incomes, marital status, and occupation, show a strong relationship with free paper readership. On the other hand, three leisure activities—gardening, outdoors, and crafting—are positive and significant predictors to help explain the heavy readership. This finding suggests that consumers who enjoy these lifestyles use free papers as one commercial source to fulfill their particular needs for advertising information. The finding is consistent with that of Donohew, Palmgreen, and Rayburn⁹³ who examined different lifestyles and patterns of media use. Therefore, the stereotype of “junk papers” is invalid when it is used to explain the perceptions of free papers.

Advertising media planners frequently segment media market and audience behaviors before deciding what media to select or reject in an advertising campaign. The final regression model of the study shows that the heavier reader uses free papers to find valuable information on products/services such as Home/Equipment and Food/Supplies. The model also includes multiple variables of age, Master Gardeners, Outdoor People, and two categories of uses and gratifications as predictors. The finding suggests that the niche market of heavy readers reveals different descriptive characteristics that could be an important market segment for free papers to reach. Socializers are the only group that shows a significant association with lighter readership. This finding implies that there is a displacement relationship between the particular leisure activity and free paper readership, measured from the viewpoint of social behaviors. Both positive and negative associations of free papers with leisure behaviors reinforce the early studies of Brown, Cramond, and Wilde,⁹⁴ Lee and Kuo,⁹⁵ and Neuman,⁹⁶ who found the displacement and reinforcement effect of media use with other behaviors.

In summary, free papers are regarded as a convenient and relevant information source providing information surveillance and product values. Several groups of consumers are identified as heavy readers and possess different market attributes that could be useful to advertisers. Free paper readership can be explained in the multivariate model that has the theoretical framework of uses and gratifications.

Of course, the sample of the study is limited to one Midwestern state. One way to broaden the study and ascertain if the findings can be confirmed in other geographical regions would be to expand the study to other regions in the United States. The study includes only twelve uses and gratifications items. Future research could include more.

The current study analyzed the variables of demographics, leisure activities, products/service information sources, and uses and gratifica-

tions. Research in the next phase could include analyses of media competitors, especially the effects of displacement or reinforcement relative to paid daily newspapers, weekly newspapers, and even the Internet as sources of advertising information. The results would benefit advertisers who can judge the functions of free papers from a multi-dimensional point of view. Future research also could focus on the ties between free papers and communities that could reveal the economic interrelationships and implications.

NOTES

1. George Brandsberg, *The Free Papers* (Ames, IA: Wordsmith Books, 1969), 2; Victor Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival* (Richmond, IN: Graphic Press, 2000), 10-14; William J. Thorn with Mary P. Pfeil, *Newspaper Circulation: Marketing the News* (New York: Longman Inc., 1987), 4.

2. Thorn and Pfeil, *Newspaper Circulation: Marketing the News*, 4.

3. Leo Bogart, *Press And Public: Who Reads What, When, Where, and Why in American Newspapers* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1981).

4. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 3; L. M. Stein, "Still Searching for its Identity," *Editor & Publisher*, 4 June 1988, 14-15.

5. David C. Coulson, Stephen Lacy, and Jonathan Wilson, "Weekly Newspapers—Solid Industry With Many Variations," *Newspaper Research Journal* 22 (summer 2001): 16-29; Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 251.

6. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 6-8.

7. Coulson, Lacy, and Wilson, "Weekly Newspapers—Solid Industry With Many Variations," 25-26; Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 8.

8. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 244.

9. Brian Gay, "Free Papers Have a Secret," *Free Paper Publisher*, November 1999, 20; Stein, "Still Searching for its Identity," 14-15.

10. Judy Goddard, "Why Big Fish Avoid the Small Pond...The Reasons Most National Advertisers Don't Use Community Newspapers," *Marketing Magazine*, 7 October 1996, 18.

11. Leo Bogart, *Press and Public: Who Reads What, When, Where, and Why in American Newspapers* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989), 36-38; Mark Fitzgerald, "Why the Superstores Reject Newspaper Ads," *Editor & Publisher*, 20 June 1992, 11; Glen G. Nowak, Glen T. Cameron, and Dean M. Krugman, "How Local Advertisers Choose and Use Advertising Media," *Journal of Advertising Research* 33 (1993): 39-49.

12. Brandsberg, *The Free Papers*, 131-32; Goddard, "Why Big Fish Avoid the Small Pond...The Reasons Most National Advertisers Don't Use Community Newspapers," 18; Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 8.

13. Arthur G. Emig, "Community Ties and Dependence on Media for

Public Affairs," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 72 (summer 1995): 402-411; Keith R. Stamm, "The Contribution of Local Media to Community Involvement," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 74 (spring 1997): 97-107.

14. Coulson, Lacy, and Wilson, "Weekly Newspapers—Solid Industry With Many Variations," 16-29; Stephen Lacy, David C. Coulson, and Hiromi Cho, "Competition for Readers Among U.S. Metropolitan Daily, Nonmetropolitan Daily, and Weekly Newspapers," *The Journal of Media Economics* 15 (1 2002): 21-40.

15. Jerry R. Lynn and Ellen M. Bennett, "Newspaper Readership Patterns in Non-metropolitan Communities," *Newspaper Research Journal* 1 (July 1980): 18-24; William A. Tillinghast, "Declining Newspaper Readership: Impact of Region and Urbanization," *Journalism Quarterly* 58 (spring 1981): 14-23, 50.

16. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 2.

17. Brandsberg, *The Free Papers*, 2.

18. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 4.

19. Brandsberg, *The Free Papers*, 14-32; Bogart, *Press and Public: Who Reads What, When, Where, and Why in American Newspapers*, 1989, 54; Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 1-9.

20. Coulson, Lacy, and Wilson, "Weekly Newspapers—Solid Industry With Many Variations," 18; Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 4.

21. Thorn and Pfeil, *Newspaper Circulation: Marketing the News*, 73; Kenneth R. White, Chris T. Anzalone, and Donald Barbour, "The Effectiveness of Shopper Guides," *Journal of Advertising Research* 20 (April 1980): 17-24.

22. White, Anzalone, and Barbour, "The Effectiveness of Shopper Guides," 17-24.

23. Carolyn A. Lin, "Looking Back: The Contribution of Blumler and Katz's Uses of Mass Communication to Communication Research," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 40 (fall 1996): 574-81.

24. Elihu Katz, Jay G. Blumler, and M. Gurevitch, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," in *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research*, ed. Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1974), 19-34.

25. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," 19-34.

26. Stephanie O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," *European Journal of Advertising* 28 (8/9, 1994): 55.

27. Werner J. Severin and James W. Tankard, Jr., *Communication Theories* (New York: Longman, 1992), 274-76.

28. Severin and Tankard, *Communication Theories*, 274-76.

29. Herta Herzog, "What Do We Really Know About Day-time Serial Listeners," in *Radio Research 1942-1943*, ed. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1942), 50-55.

30. E. Suchman, "An Invitation to Music," in *Radio Research 1942-1943*, ed. Lazarsfeld and Stanton.

31. Bernard Berelson, "What 'Missing the Newspaper' Means," in

Communication Research, ed. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton (New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce, 1948-49), 36-37.

32. Roger D. Wimmer and Joseph R. Dominick, *Mass Media Research: An Introduction* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003), 407-408; Swen Windahl, "Uses and Gratifications at the Crossroads," in *Mass Communication Review Yearbook*, ed. G. Wilhoit and H. deBock (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1981), 174-85.

33. David L. Swanson, "Gratification Seeking, Media Exposure, and Audience Interpretations: Some Directions for Research," *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* 31 (summer 1987): 237-54.

34. Swanson, "Gratification Seeking, Media Exposure, and Audience Interpretations: Some Directions for Research," 244.

35. Kim Rotzoll, James E. Haefner, and Charles H. Sandage, "Advertising and the Classical Liberal World View," in *Advertising in Society*, ed. Roxanne Hovland and Gary B. Wilcox (Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Business Books, 1989), 38.

36. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 55.

37. A. Hedges, *Testing to Destruction* (London: IPA, 1974); O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 55.

38. Joseph T. Plummer, "A Theoretical View of Advertising Communication," *Journal of Communication* 21 (December 1971): 315-25.

39. Plummer, "A Theoretical View of Advertising Communication," 315-25.

40. Mary Jane Schlinger, "A Profile of Responses to Commercials," *Journal of Advertising Research* 19 (April 1979): 37-46.

41. Keith Crosier, "Towards a Praxiology of Advertising," *International Journal of Advertising* 2 (3, 1983): 215-32.

42. Linda F. Alwitt and Paul R. Prabhaker, "Functional and Belief Dimensions of Attitudes to Television Advertising: Implications for Copywriting," *Journal of Advertising Research* 32 (September/October 1992): 30-42; O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 52-75.

43. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 71.

44. Dennis F. Hale, "An Examination of the Perceptions of Newspaper Advertisements," *Newspaper Research Journal* 1 (February 1980): 59-64.

45. Garrett J. O'Keefe, Kathaleen Nash, and Jenny Liu, "The Perceived Utility Of Advertising," *Journalism Quarterly* 58 (winter 1981): 536-42.

46. Gerald L. Grotta, Ernest F. Larkin, and Barbara De Plois, "How Readers Perceive and Use a Small Daily Newspaper," *Journalism Quarterly* 52 (winter 1975): 711-15.

47. Michael E. Abrams, Arthur J. Kaul, and Christina Ma, "Social Class and Perceived Utility of Newspaper Advertising," *Newspaper Research Journal* 1 (November 1979): 42-47.

48. Grotta, Larkin and De Plois, "How Readers Perceive and Use a Small Daily Newspaper," 711-15.

49. William F. Griswold, Jr. and Roy L. Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," *Newspaper Research Journal* 10 (winter 1989): 55-56.

50. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 59.

-
51. Brandsberg, *The Free Papers*, 47.
 52. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 56.
 53. Wayne M. Towers, "Weekday and Sunday Readership Seen Through Uses and Gratifications," *Newspaper Research Journal* 6 (spring 1985): 20-32.
 54. Paul E. Willis, *Common Culture: Symbolic Work at Play in the Everyday Cultures of the Young* (Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press, 1990).
 55. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 64.
 56. Severin and Tankard, *Communication Theories*, 275.
 57. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 59.
 58. Ramu Govindasamy and John Italia, "Evaluating Consumer Use of Food Advertisements: The Influence of Socio-economic Characteristics," *Journal of Food Products Marketing* 5 (1, 1998): 3-15.
 59. Abrams, Kaul, and Ma, "Social Class and Perceived Utility of Newspaper Advertising," 42-47.
 60. Caryl Kahn, "How the Media Influences Woman's Perceptions of Health Care," *Marketing Health Services* 21 (spring 2001): 13-17.
 61. Abhilasha Mehta and Scott C. Purvis, "Consumer Response to Print Prescription Drug Advertising," *Journal of Advertising Research* 43 (June 2003): 194-206.
 62. Leo W. Jeffres, Connie Cutietta, Jae-won Lee, and Leslie Sekerka, "Differences of Community Newspaper Goals and Functions in Large Urban Areas," *Newspaper Research Journal* 20 (summer 1999): 86-98.
 63. Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch, "Utilization of Mass Communication by the Individual," 22.
 64. John Dimmick and Eric Rothenbuhler, "The Theory of the Niche: Quantifying Competition Among Media Industries," *Journal of Communication* 34 (winter 1984): 103-119.
 65. Icek Ajzen and B. L. Driver, "Application of Planned Behavior to Leisure Choice," *Journal of Leisure Research* 24 (3, 1992): 207-224; William D. Danko and Charles M. Schaninger, "Attitudinal and Leisure Activity Differences Across Modernized Household Life Cycle Categories," *Advances in Consumer Research* 17 (1, 1990): 886-94; Douglass K. Hawes, "Leisure and Consumer Behavior," *Academy of Marketing Science Journal* 4 (fall 1979): 391-403.
 66. Bogart, *Press and Public: Who Reads What, When, Where, and Why in American Newspapers*, 1981, 255-62; Thorn and Pfeil, *Newspaper Circulation: Marketing the News*, 271.
 67. Scott David and Fern K. Willits, "Adolescent and Adult Leisure Patterns: A Reassessment," *Journal of Leisure Research* 30 (3d Quarter 1998): 319-31.
 68. J. R. Brown, J. K. Cramond, and R. J. Wilde, "Displacement Effects of Television and the Child's Functional Orientation to Media," in *The Uses of Mass Communications: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research*, ed. Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Publications, 1974), 93-112; Waipeng Lee and Eddie Y. C. Kuo, "Internet and Displacement Effect: Children's Media Use and Activities in Singapore," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 7 (2, 2002): 414-40, < <http://www.ascusc.org/jcmc/vol7/issue2>>; Susan B. Neuman, "The Displacement Effect: Assessing the Relation Between Television Viewing and Reading Performance," *Reading Research Quarterly* 23 (fall 1988): 414-40.

69. Julie Napoli and Michael T. Ewing, "The Net Generation: An Analysis of Lifestyles, Attitudes and Media Habits," *Journal of International Consumer Marketing* 13 (1, 2001): 21-34.

70. Stephan R. Fox, *The Mirror Makers: A History of American Advertising and Its Creators* (New York: William Morrow, 1984); Michael Schudson, "Advertising as Capitalist Realism," in *Advertising in Society*, ed. Roxanne Hovland and Gary B. Wilcox (Lincolnwood, IL: NTC Business Books, 1989), 73-98.

71. Schudson, "Advertising as Capitalist Realism," 74.

72. Rotzoll, Haefner, and Sandage, "Advertising and the Classical Liberal World View," 27-41.

73. Plummer, "A Theoretical View of Advertising Communication," 315-25.

74. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 72.

75. Stephen J. Hoch and Young-Won Ha, "Consumer Learning: Advertising and the Ambiguity of Product Experience," *Journal of Consumer Research* 13 (September 1986): 221-33; DeAnna S. Kempf and Russell N. Laczniak, "Advertising's Influence on Subsequent Product Trial Processing," *Journal of Advertising* 30 (fall 2001): 27-38.

76. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 55-66.

77. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 59.

78. Denis McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory* (London: Sages Publications, 1994), 320.

79. McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory*, 320.

80. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 72.

81. Griswold and Moore, "Factors Affecting Readership of News and Advertising in a Small Daily Newspaper," 55-66; Grotta, Larkin, and De Plois, "How Readers Perceive and Use A Small Daily Newspaper," 711-15; Towers, "Weekday and Sunday Readership Seen Through Uses and Gratifications," 20-32.

82. Danko and Schaninger, "Attitudinal and Leisure Activity Differences Across Modernized Household Life Cycle Categories," 886-94.

83. Scott and Willits, "Adolescent and Adult Leisure Patterns: A Reassessment," 319-31.

84. McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory*.

85. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications."

86. Variables that do not meet the cutoff scores are dining out, entertaining friends/relatives, going to arts and crafts shows, going to beach or countryside, going to concerts or plays, going to the movies, participat-

ing in a social club, participating in sports, playing cards, reading books/magazines, relaxing/mediating/praying, shopping, taking photos/making videos, visiting with friends/relatives, and volunteering your services.

87. Variables that do not meet the cutoff scores are apparel, cellular phones, furniture, home improvements, major appliances, new cars/trucks/vans, plumbing/electrical services, and television/stereos.

88. McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory*, 320.

89. O'Donohoe, "Advertising Uses and Gratifications," 72.

90. McQuail, *Mass Communication Theory*, 314-20.

91. Swanson, "Gratification Seeking, Media Exposure, and Audience Interpretations: Some Directions for Research," 237-54.

92. Jose, *The Free Paper in America: Struggle for Survival*, 3.

93. Lewis Donohew, Philip Palmgreen, and J. D. Rayburn II, "Social and Psychological Origins of Media Use: A Lifestyle Analysis," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 31 (summer 1987): 255-78.

94. Brown, Cramond, and Wilde, "Displacement Effects of Television and the Child's Functional Orientation to Media."

95. Lee and Kuo, "Internet and Displacement Effect: Children's Media Use and Activities in Singapore."

96. Neuman, "The Displacement Effect: Assessing the Relation Between Television Viewing and Reading Performance."